

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 BGH HOLDINGS, LLC et al.,  
10  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 DL EVANS BANK,  
14 Defendant.

Case No. 2:18-CV-1408-RSL

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
FOR RELIEF FROM CASE  
DEADLINES AND  
DENYING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR RELIEF  
FROM DISCOVERY  
DEADLINE

16 This matter comes before the Court on defendant DL Evans Bank's ("the Bank")  
17 "Motion and Cross Motion for Relief from Case Deadlines," see Dkt. #61, and plaintiffs'  
18 "Motion for Relief from Discovery Completion Deadline for Taking Depositions." Dkt. #45. On  
19 November 21, 2018, the Court issued a minute order setting various deadlines. Dkt. #17. The  
20 Bank requests that the Court extend the discovery cutoff date, trial date, and all associated  
21 deadlines by 120 days. Dkt. #61 at 1. Plaintiffs request that the deadline for completing  
22 discovery be extended to June 28, 2019 for taking depositions. Dkt. #45 at 1.


23  
24 "A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R.  
25 Civ. P. 16(b)(4). "Good cause" means that "the scheduling deadlines cannot be met despite the  
26 party's diligence." Paz v. City of Aberdeen, No. C13-5104 RJB, 2013 WL 6163016, at \*2 (W.D.  
27 Wash. Nov. 25, 2013) (citing Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th

28 ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RELIEF  
FROM CASE DEADLINES AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM DISCOVERY DEADLINE - 1

1 Cir. 1992)). “If the party seeking the modification was not diligent, the inquiry should end.” Id.  
2 (citing Millenkamp v. Davisco Foods Intern., Inc., 448 Fed. Appx. 720, 721 (9th Cir. 2011)).  
3 The Court ruled on plaintiffs’ “Motion to Strike Pleading” on June 14, 2019 and allowed the  
4 Bank to add counterclaims and additional parties. Dkt. #71. The Bank states that it needs more  
5 time to serve the newly-added parties, propound discovery, and file motions for summary  
6 judgment. Dkt. #61 at 5. Plaintiffs did not respond to the Bank’s motion. There is good cause for  
7 modifying the case schedule order. Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609. The Court need not reach the  
8 parties’ contentions regarding their discovery disputes. See Dkts. #46, #58–59, #63, #65.

9 For all the foregoing reasons, the Bank’s motion for relief from case deadlines, Dkt. #61,  
10 is GRANTED. The Court will issue an amended case schedule that extends all case deadlines.  
11 Plaintiffs’ motion for relief from discovery deadline, Dkt. #45, is DENIED AS MOOT.

12 DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2019.

13  
14  
15 

16 Robert S. Lasnik  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27